

Following discussions with Lancaster University in 2014-15, it was decided that the periodic review document was no longer fit for purpose and that partner colleges could determine how they would meet the requirements of periodic review through existing processes where appropriate.

Recommendations

Current programme, school and college monitoring and review processes are very detailed, effective and consistent, providing opportunities at a range of levels for the assurance of standards and the identification of ongoing enhancement to the student experience. The mapping exercise against the indicators of B8 (see appendix) and a review of existing templates and guidance suggests however that there are opportunities for further development:

The APR and SED templates should be reviewed to ensure they fully reflect the requirements of B8

The revalidation document template should be amended to include a clear consideration of the cumulative impact of changes and feedback on the programme over time

There should be a comparable revalidation process introduced for HN provision to enable a more formal periodic evaluation

There should be terms of reference for the APR and SED panels to include membership

There should be formal reference in the academic regulations to monitoring and review processes

REGIONAL TEACHING PARTNERS

MONITORING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

SEC/2015/3/0292

APPENDIX			
B8 - The Indicators of sound practice	Programme monitoring	Programme review	Organisational oversight
<p>Indicator 1 Higher education providers maintain strategic oversight of the processes for, and outcomes of, programme monitoring and programme review, to ensure processes are applied systematically and operated consistently.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PQM/HE QAM • Annual Programme Review (APR) • Annual Self-Evaluation Documents (SED) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revalidation cycle (Outline Planning Permission (OPP), stages 1, 2 and 3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APR panels • SED panels • College SED • Reports to ASDC/HEAB and awarding body partners
<p>Indicator 2 Higher education providers take deliberate steps to use the outcomes of programme monitoring and review processes for enhancement purposes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APR QIPs • SED QIPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes at each stage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College SED QIP • Regular reviews of QIPs and reporting on outcomes to HEAB etc
<p>Indicator 3 Higher education providers operate a process to protect the academic interests of students when a programme is closed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course Closure document • Consideration in APR/SED as appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only where, for example, a pathway as part of a wider suite of provision might have been closed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASDC consideration and agreement
<p>Indicator 4 Higher education providers define processes, roles and responsibilities for programme monitoring and programme review and communicate them to those involved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SharePoint • HE Committees Handbook • Academic regulations • Staff development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SharePoint • Academic regulations • Staff development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASDC/HEAB oversight
<p>Indicator 5 Higher education providers evaluate their processes for programme monitoring and review and take action to improve them where necessary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular review of APR and SED processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular review of re-validation processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASDC/AMT

REGIONAL TEACHING PARTNERS

MONITORING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

SEC/2015/3/0292

<p>Indicator 6 Higher education providers make use of reference points and draw on expertise from those outside the programme in their processes for programme monitoring and review.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APR peer review and panel membership • SED peer review and panel membership • Students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External subject specialist in revalidation • Awarding body partners • PSRBs, employers etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASDC/HEAB oversight
<p>Indicator 7 Higher education providers involve students in programme monitoring and review processes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are integral to the revalidation process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASDC/HEAB oversight
<p>Indicator 8 Higher education providers enable staff and other participants to contribute effectively to programme monitoring and programme review by putting in place appropriate arrangements for their support and development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual staff development plus consultations around templates etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full supporting staff development offer around B1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASDC/HEAB oversight

Guidance for Periodic Review Panel Members

PURPOSE OF THE APPROVAL PANEL

Its purpose is -

- To review the past period of validation of the programme (s).
- To facilitate discussion on potential changes to the programme (s) as part of the revalidation process.

In doing so the panel shall:-

- Advise how the quality of provision and student experience could be enhanced, including giving recommendations for actions.
- Identify good/innovative or commendable practice.
- Advise on the currency of the programme(s) in the context of academic, professional, statutory, or regulatory changes, and wider changes in the employment market.

ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTATION

The panel will consider the following documentation

- The last three Annual Programme Reviews of the programme (s) under consideration.
- A brief critical commentary produced by the programme team. The commentary should be reflective, address key issues, and give the panel an honest indication of how the programme has been running while identifying key strengths.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW PANEL

The approval panel shall be conducted by: -

- A UCBC Head of School (Chair).
- A Validation Officer.
- An external subject specialist.

**REGIONAL TEACHING PARTNERS
MONITORING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES**

SEC/2015/3/0292

- A current student.

The **Chair** shall –

- Manage the agenda for the day.
- Guide the Panel in its deliberations and consideration of issues.
- Ensure engagement of all members of the panel in deliberations and consideration of issues.
- Ensure that the panel operates within its terms of reference.
- Provide formal feedback.

The **External Subject Specialist** shall –

- Provide guidance on the curriculum and other subject-related issues.
- Consider the equivalence of academic standards and quality of learning opportunities with other institutions.
- Advise on wider academic and contextual changes within the subject area that may impact upon the future direction of the programmes.

The **Student Panel Member** shall –

- Review the proposals from a student perspective and assist the panel in assessing the quality of student experience on the programme.
- Explore student opinion and feedback.

The **Validation Officer** shall -

- Provide guidance on procedures and regulations.
- Assist the Chair in ensuring that the panel operates within its terms of reference.
- Assist the panel in collating and summarising the main points of the review and ensure that a written report of the panel is produced.

Periodic Review indicative agenda –

**REGIONAL TEACHING PARTNERS
MONITORING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES**

SEC/2015/3/0292

Timings	Meeting	Required Attendees
09.10am	Panel Meeting	Panel
09.30am	Review of employer feedback	Programme Leader Business Engagement / HE Placement team
10.00am	Panel meeting with current students	Student Representatives: at least one from each level of the programmes
10.30am	Review of the period of validation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance and enhancement of standards and quality • Review of recruitment, retention and achievement • Review of programme resourcing • Review of learning, teaching and assessment 	Academic Registrar Centre Management Programme team
12.00 pm	Preparation for revalidation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of QAA Subject Benchmark Statements • Review of academic developments • Review of Professional, statutory and regulatory body frameworks • Strategy for the programmes and subject area • Discussion of potential changes to the programmes 	Academic Registrar Centre Management Programme team
20 mins	Panel Meeting with lunch	Panel
20 mins	Identification of good practice and agreement of action plan	Academic Registrar Centre Management Programme team